

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Overhage et al ("Overhage") and Hong et al ("Hong"). The Examiner states that Thompson teaches a serial data cursor for an analog waveform display. Applicant submits that Thompson teaches a serial data cursor for a digital graphic display (Fig. 7) – digital data in the form of "1"s and "0"s rather than an analog waveform (see Fig. 3 of Applicant's application). The Examiner states that Thompson teaches a cursor representation having a horizontal length equal to a "word-time" for the serial digital data stream derived from a specified protocol. Applicant submits that Thompson teaches a cursor having a variable length dependent upon a particular data segment rather than equal to a "word-time" for the serial digital data stream since the AES/EBU data has no specified word length. Also the length of the cursor in Thompson is a function of a number of bits rather than a "word-time". Since in Thompson the protocol is already known, there is no "derivation" from a specified protocol. The Examiner further states that Thompson recovers a clock from the serial digital data, but in fact Thompson only decodes the AES/EBU data – there is no statement at column 3, lines 17-20 about recovering the clock from the serial data stream. Finally the Examiner states that Thompson decodes a portion of the analog waveform display delimited by the cursor representation to present a human readable content display, where in fact Thompson decodes the entire AES/EBU frame and presents the entire frame of data in a human readable content display, not just

the portion of the analog waveform delimited by the cursor.

The Examiner admits that Thompson does not teach an analog waveform display, but cites Overhage as teaching an analog waveform display. However Applicant submits that what Overhage teaches is a normal oscilloscope waveform display with a conventional cursor, and there is nothing to teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art how to combine Overhage with Thompson to produce the invention as recited by Applicant in claim 1. Applicant submits that the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight.

The Examiner further admits that Thompson fails to teach an analog waveform represented by a corresponding serial digital data stream, but that Hong teaches an analog waveform represented by a corresponding serial digital data stream. Applicant submits that the Examiner is proceeding in a backwards manner. What Applicant claims is an digital data stream represented by an analog waveform, not vice versa as indicated by the Examiner. Applicant fails to see why Hong would be combined with Thompson since Applicant is not addressing any of the problems the Examiner is citing Hong for – input signal degradation due to media noise, thermal noise, amplitude variation, electromagnetic interference, phase misalignments, transients and DC offsets. These problems addressed by Hong are only a result of attempting to convert the analog signal (Fig. 1B) to a digital representation by comparing to an analog pattern (Fig. 1A). None of this is pertinent to Applicant's claimed invention.


Therefore, since neither Thompson nor Overhage nor Hong teach all of the elements as recited by Applicant in claim 1, especially the derivation of "word-time" from a specified protocol and recovered clock, claim 1 and claims 4

and 7 together with claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 dependent therefrom are deemed to be allowable as being nonobvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over Thompson, Overhage and Hong.

In view of the foregoing comments allowance of claims 1-9 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FREDERICK A. AZINGER

By 
Francis I. Gray
Reg. No. 27,788
Attorney for Applicant

TEKTRONIX, INC.
P. O. Box 500, MS 50-LAW
Beaverton, Oregon 97077
(503) 627-7261

Attorney's Docket No. 7092-US